

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/745,960	STROBEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kathryn Odland	3743

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Kathryn Odland.

(3) _____.

(2) Steven Simonis.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 19 November 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 9-11, 20, 23

Prior art documents discussed:

Jammet (US 5,941,882), Simonian et al. (US 6,099,530) and Gresser et al. (US 6,241,771)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



Kathryn Odland

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was contacted in an attempt to amend the claims in order to place the case in condition for allowance. Applicant continues to argue the term "interference." The term was not given a special definition in the application. Thus, the examiner is required to take a reasonably broad interpretation, such as that given in the dictionary. Further, the intended use does not hold patentable weight in apparatus claims. Claims 11 and 23 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Also, other possible claim amendments were discussed. However, applicant was not willing to amend the claims..